



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.

THE SCENE-HEADINGS IN THE EARLY RECENSIONS OF
PLAUTUS.

BY H. W. PRESCOTT.

The names of many characters in Plautus's plays, — e.g. the name of the 'matrona' in the *Menaechmi*, — are unknown to us. Why? It is because the 'Palatine' MSS. (*i.e.* all our MSS. with the exception of the Ambrosian Palimpsest) so often state only the professions, — 'matrona,' 'servus,' 'miles,' 'ancilla,' and the like, — and not the names. On the other hand, the scene-headings in *A*, the fragmentary Ambrosian Palimpsest, normally contain the names. Thus the name of the old man in the *Casina*, — a name which does not appear in the text of the play, — is known to us because we have the scene-headings of *A* for this play; but the Palatine MSS. (*P*) show merely the word SENEX. In *A* the proper names in the scene-headings are normally followed by a blank line. It is well known that in ancient recensions of dramatic authors the proper names occupied the first line of the scene-heading, the professions the second line; thus:

LYSIDAMVS
SENEX.

One of these lines was usually written in color. In *A* the second (colored) line was probably washed out when the MS. became palimpsest. It is also possible that it had been left blank for the 'rubricator' to fill in, a duty which he never performed; for nothing is more common in MSS. of all centuries than to find blank spaces where colored letters ought to stand. This suggests an explanation of the imperfect scene-headings in our Palatine MSS. *In some early archetype of the 'Palatine' text the first line of the scene-headings was colored, or rather was meant to be colored. The 'rubricator' neglected his duty; and the proper names had to be recovered from the text by some later copyist.* Are the facts consistent with this theory?

A comparison of the names in the 'Palatine' scene-headings with the text of Plautus shows that in the majority of cases the names do occur in the text of the plays. In fact there are only about twenty-

five cases which seem to need special attention. These are cases which (1) seem to refute our theory, and (2) seem to furnish substantial proof that our theory is correct.

The cases which appear to refute the theory may be roughly classed as those in which names appear in scene-headings of Palatine MSS. that do not occur in the text, and those in which names are omitted in the scene-headings that do occur in the text. The former of these classes offers much the greater difficulty to our theory; but the cases that belong to this class are strikingly few.

Asin. II iv. The Palatine MSS. here give CHLAMIDATVS, while for the same character in II iii the same MSS. give MERCATOR. Before v. 431 *B* has *clamidatus* as the name of the speaker, and also before v. 410 (according to Leo). Editors are agreed that 'chlamydatus' cannot be the proper name assigned by Plautus to the 'mercator,' and so exclude it from the Tabula Personarum at the beginning of the play. The occurrence of the word does not, therefore, offer much difficulty to our theory, so long as it is not a 'bona fide' proper name, and would not have appeared in the first line of the original scene-heading.

Aul. II vii FITODICVS SERVVS. The name *Pythodicus* does not occur in the play. Dziatzko and Leo would substitute it for *Strobilus* in vv. 264, 334, 351, 354. Goetz (praef. viii) thinks the play shows signs of 'retractatio': in one version the name was 'Strobilus,' in the other 'Pythodicus'; in the text, as we have it, the two have been mixed. These views have been presented entirely without consideration of the theory at present under discussion. We must remember that the last part of the play has been lost, and that it is quite possible that the name *Pythodicus* (written *fitodicus*) appeared in the text of some scene which is not now extant.

Aul. IV vii. The same is true of the occurrence of PHAEDRIA as the name of the 'virgo' in this scene-heading. The name does not appear in the text as we have it; but it may well have appeared in a lost part of the play.

Cist. II iii, IV i, ii. PHANOSTRATA appears in the 'Palatine' scene-headings; but the name is not mentioned in the text. The play, however, is notoriously fragmentary, so that this case again does not materially weaken our argument.

Mil. III ii LVCRIO stands as the name of a 'puer' who appears only in this scene. This name does not occur in the text; but in v. 843 our Palatine MSS.¹ present a 'vox nihili,' *uotio* or *uocio*. This word has been emended from the scene-heading to *Lucrio*; others read *Lurcio*, *Lotio*; others an adverb. That some proper name should be read, whether *Lucrio* or *Lurcio*, is generally accepted by editors (Ritschl, Goetz and Schoell, Leo). *Lucrio* (cf. *lūcrum*) seems unmetrical, *Lurcio* (cf. *lurco* or *lurcho*, not *-io*) of rather dubious formation; and the change of *lurcio* to *uocio* not easily to be accounted for palaeographically. It must be admitted, however, that a proper name is most fitting in this passage:

si fálsa dices uotio excrucíabere.

The uncertainty of the reading, however, serves to weaken considerably the opposition that this case would otherwise present to our thesis.

The second class of scene-headings, which I have described as omitting the names of characters that do occur in the text of the plays, is much easier to dispose of. The absence of proper names was, as we have seen, an occasional feature of the 'Palatine' scene-headings. Our theory that some early scribe had filled up blanks by a reference to the occurrences of the name in the text does not imply that he left not a single blank unfilled which it was possible to fill. Even if he did, the defective type of scene-heading supplied by those 'tituli' which he was compelled to leave unaltered, may have led subsequent copyists to allow themselves to omit a name here and there, where it suited their convenience. For instance, in the *Captivi* the first scene² of the first act, and the same scene of the third show in the extant MSS. only PARASITVS; but in IV i and

¹ The Ambrosian Palimpsest is almost wholly illegible in this part of the play.

² [Notice that the first line of this scene (v. 68) would offer a difficulty to the recovery of the true name *Ergasilus* from the text: *Iuventus nomen indidit Scorto mihi*. If the lost original of our extant MSS. should by some lucky chance be unearthed, I should not be surprised to find the scene-heading here written SCORTVM PARASITVS, just as the scene-heading in the *Menaechmi* (I i) is PENICVLVS PARASITVS; the first line of the scene being: *Iuventus nomen fecit Peniculo mihi*. — W. M. L.]

ii ERGASILUS appears as well as PARASITVS. The mere fact that a name which appears in the text does not appear in the scene-inscription is in no way destructive of the theory that the names in the scene-inscriptions of an early archetype were derived from the text. There are, however, two varieties in this class of scene-inscriptions. First, there are those like the one in the *Captivi* already mentioned, in which the name, though missing at the head of one scene, turns up at the head of another. Of this variety I shall not treat at all. A second variety, in which names that are found in the text do not appear at all in any scene-heading, may seem to need attention. So much may be said at the outset, however, that the explanation which applies to the first variety of this class is equally applicable, in my judgment, to this second variety. We shall, however, find that some other explanations call for recognition.

Bacch. IV vii. The name *Artamo* occurs in vv. 799, 832 ; but the scene-heading has merely LORARIVS. Since the other proper names in this scene-heading are supplied, we might expect to have ARTAMO also. Still it is not unusual to find some proper names in scene-headings without others. The omission in this case may be explained by the fact that the 'lorarius' in Plautus is not usually dignified with a name, so that the scribe who filled in the names from the text felt no need of searching for it.

Epid. (pass.). There are three omissions in the scene-headings of this play. The name *Philippa*, which occurs in v. 636, does not appear in the scene-headings of IV i (post v. 525) and ii ; *Acropolistis* (vv. 479, 503 ; cf. 568) does not appear at IV ii ; *Telestis* (v. 635) at V i. The omission of the name of *Acropolistis* may be due to the fact that she played the subordinate part of a flute-girl ; yet the 'tibicinae' in Aul. II iv have their names preserved in the scene-headings of *B* (cf. v. 333). The omission of *Philippa* and *Telestis* may be explained by the general principle already laid down. These names, however, it should be noted, occur in the play only once in each case.

Mil. V i. The name of the 'coquus' is not given, though it occurs as *Cario* in vv. 1397, 1427. Here again we are dealing with a quite unimportant character.

(Most. II i b. In v. 419 *Sphaerio* is read by a very plausible conjecture as the name of the 'puer,' a 'muta persona' ; but the scene-

heading may have been left blank in the original of our extant MSS., for it is only the 'corrector' of the Codex Ursinianus (D²) who is responsible for the inscription TRANIO S(eruus) PVER.)

Most. III i, IV i. The money-lender appears as DANISTA in the scene-inscription, but is called *Misargyrides* in v. 568. The MSS., however, quite obscure the name in this line (*mi sarcirites* B, *mis artirites* CD); so the name could hardly have been elicited from the text.

Most. IV i, IV ii. The latter part of the play is, as is well known, in considerable confusion in the Palatine MSS. The scene-heading of IV i makes no mention of *Phaniscus* and *Pinacium*, the 'adversitores' (D² has ADVERSITORES). Their names, though somewhat illegible, are preserved in the scene-heading of A. The name *Phaniscus* occurs in v. 886 only, while *Pinacium* does not appear in the text. The evidence against our theory is, therefore, too insignificant for notice.

Pers. (pass.). The omission in various scene-headings of the name of the 'virgo' is hardly surprising, for neither of the names given to her in the text is a genuine name. *Persa* is simply a descriptive epithet, 'the Persian girl'; *Lucris* (vv. 624, 627) an occasion for a pun.

Rud. I v. We find SACERDOS (only in D), though the name *Ptolemocratia* occurs in v. 481. The Palatine reading in this line, however, *ptolemeo gratia*, may well have been unintelligible to the copyist whom we suppose to have supplied the names from the text, or the character too unimportant to induce him to hunt for the name.

We find, then, that the cases in which the names of characters occur in the text of the plays but not in the scene-headings may be explained either on the general principle that proper names were occasionally omitted from scene-inscriptions, or by a reference to the fact that the character in question is unimportant, or the text unintelligible, or the name hardly 'bona fide.' It remains to discuss the cases which seem to offer strong support to our theory of the genesis of the proper names in the scene-headings of the Palatine MSS.

Cas. (pass.). The name of Lysidamus, one of the leading characters, does not appear in the scene-headings of the Palatine MSS.;

we know it only from *A* (III iii, iv, v, vi ; IV iii). The name does not occur in the text. Instead of 'Lysidamus,' the Palatine scene-headings offer STALITIO (II iii), STALICIO (III iii). This curious name is due to a ludicrous misconception of two lines : v. 347, where for *tittibilicio* the Palatine MSS. show the corruption *tibi stalitio*, and v. 955, where *heus sta ilico* has become in these MSS. *heus stalicio*. In both lines the person addressed is Lysidamus, so that the corrupt reading of the MSS. would suggest this 'vox nihili' *Stalitio (-cio)* as the name of the 'senex.'

Cist. II ii, iii ; IV i, ii ; V i. The Palatine MSS. in these scene-headings show LAMPADISCVS ; but, as the text frequently attests, the real name of the slave was *Lampadio*. The explanation of this anomaly is not far to seek. The pet-name *Lampadiscus* occurs in v. 544 ; the copyist seized upon this, the first occurrence of the slave's name in the play, and did not look further to discover the true form of the name.

Poen. V ii. AGORASTOCLES MILPHIO POENVVS in *A* ; but the Palatine MSS. here and elsewhere show HANNO as well as POENUS. Is it not probable that the original scene-headings had nothing but POENVVS, and that 'Hanno' has been supplied by the scribe, who amplified the 'Palatine' scene-inscriptions, from vv. 996, 1124, 1127 ?¹

Stich. I i. *A* gives PHILVMENA PAMPHILA as the names of the sisters. Neither of these names occurs in the text, but one sister is called *Panegyris*, the other is not named. *Panegyris* is correctly given as the sister's name in the text of *A*. The Palatine scribe, according to our theory, finding no proper names in the scene-headings of his archetype, had to supply them from the text. He supplied the name PANEGYRIS rightly from vv. 247, 331 ; but supplied as the other sister's name PINACIVM. Now *Pinacium* is very plainly the name of the slave in the play. Why, then, did the scribe suppose it to be the name of one of the sisters ? It seems to me that he was

¹ [Poen. V iii. The strange form of the nurse's name in the Palatine scene-heading GIDDIS (but GIDDENIS rightly in *A*) may possibly have arisen from the corrupt reading of the MSS. in vv. 1119, 1130, *gidden e me* of *P* (*giddenenem A*) suggesting a nominative *Giddis*. — W. M. L.]

misled by v. 285, where the Palatine reading, *nunc expedi pinacium*, 'now relieve Pinacium' (expetit nunc pinacium, *A*), would give rise to the misapprehension that *Pinacium* was the name of the 'era egens' mentioned in this context: *eraeque egenti subveni, quae misera in expectatione est Epignomi adventum viri*. In any case the appearance of the wrong name in the Palatine scene-headings and the absence of the right name from the text are significant. That the *Philumena* of *A* may have been the name of Panegyris in another version of the play is quite possible; but to explain such a name as *Pinacium* of the Palatine MSS. in the same way is obviously wrong.

Truc. II vii. The Palatine scene-heading names the slave GETA. But *Cyamus* is the right name, as appears from vv. 583, 586, 702. Where did 'Geta' come from? Evidently from v. 577, where the Palatine MSS. read *noster geta* (*noster Cyame edd.*).

Thus, while the cases that offer support to our theory are cogent, though few, the cases that offer apparent difficulty are neither many nor at all convincing. We may then conclude that the 'matrona' in the *Menaechmi* had a name assigned to her by Plautus, and that this name would be found in the appropriate scene-headings of *A* if they had been preserved to us. Its absence from the Palatine scene-headings is due to the non-occurrence in the text; for it is from the text, and from the text alone, that the names in the Palatine scene-headings have been supplied. These names, therefore, do not belong to the direct tradition of the text.¹

¹ [This defective nature of the scene-headings in our Palatine MSS., briefly alluded to by Professor Seyffert in *Bursian's Jahresbericht*, 1886, p. 9, seems to me to bear upon the history of the ancient recensions of Plautus. For the newly discovered collation of the Codex Turnebi (*T*) indicates that the scene-headings in that MS. were in the main identical with those of our extant Palatine MSS., and, therefore, with those of their immediate original (*P*). Now a comparison of the passages in the *Rudens* defective through lacuna, as they are presented in *T* and in *P*, shews that the consensus of *T* and *P* furnishes us with the readings of a very early archetype, an archetype which contained 20 or 21 lines to the page (*A* has 19), and which was probably written in capital letters and therefore cannot be dated much later than *A* itself. In this ancient archetype the scene-headings already presented the appearance which they have in our extant minuscule